DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 230 648 UD 022 805

AUTHOR Timpane, Michael
TITLE Corporations and Public Education in the Cities.
SPONS AGENCY Carnegie Corp. of New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE May 82
NOTE 75p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperative Programs; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Quality; Education Work Relationship; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Job Training; Political Influences; *Private Financial Support; *School Business Relationship; Urban Education
IDENTIFIERS Corporate Support

ABSTRACT

This report examines the nature of the corporate interest in education in American cities, and outlines what might be done to encourage future corporate activities supportive of urban education. The report is based on a review of literature and interviews with corporate, educational, and civic leaders in several large cities. Section one discusses the pervasive influence of business and corporate interests in education in the first two decades of the twentieth century, the gradual waning of that influence, and corporations' recent attempts to redefine their interest in the public schools. Section two reviews reasons for contemporary corporate interest in education, and examines the corporate view towards its own educational programs, and its involvement in higher education and the public schools. Section three discusses quality as the major focus of corporate interest in education, and describes activities that represent the corporate response to current needs of urban education. Section four examines educators' responses to corporate activities and their growing recognition of the need to bridge the gap between schools and the business community. Section five contains conclusions and recommendations for enhancing corporate involvement in education. Appendices include a list of persons interviewed for the study, and a bibliography. (Author/MJL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED230648

Corporations and Public Education in the Cities

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Michael Timpane
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Michael Timpane

Teachers College, Columbia University

May, 1982

This report was prepared with support furnished by the Carnegie Corporation of New York.

UD022 805

INTRODUCTION

The 1980s will see a growth of corporate interest and influence in education. That much seems clear. The private business sector depends more and more upon education, in schools and in the firm, to furnish its managers and employees with the knowledge and skills they need to help the business succeed. A conservative temper is taking hold in the country, and public discussions increasingly highlight the challenges to America's economic prosperity and the need for all, including schools, to rally 'round the flag of productivity. The latent influence of the corporate sector in educational policy seems certain to be more fully realized, especially as prominent educational leaders, convinced of the need for new sources of public support and assistance, seem most willing to cooperate. Given the many legitimate and important opportunities for collaboration, the resulting activities could improve and strengthen the schools or, if they were to fall flat, undermine the legitimacy of the schools and lead the corporate community to look elsewhere to meet its educational needs.

A considerable expansion of corporate interest and activity in the schools had occurred in the 1970s, as corporate leadership began to worry about the quality and relevance of the schools, and about the stability of urban communities with troubled deteriorating schools. Under such rubrics as career education, industry-education-labor councils, loaned executives, school-to-work transitions, and so forth, many business communities were newly in touch with their local schools--but frustrated at the seeming intractability of the educational performance problem.

The objectives of this study are two: (1) to help develop a greater understanding of the nature of the corporate interest in education in the great cities, which might explain the emerging patterns of activity; and (2) to suggest steps that the public and private agencies could take to encourage and improve future corporate activities that would strengthen and support the cities' schools. Greater understanding of the corporate interest seems a necessary precondition to more effective, sustained activity to enhance corporate efforts. The motives ascribed to corporate involvement range from the noblest impulse to strengthen the democratic free enterprise system to the narrowly self-interested desire to gain public relations advantages. In every actual case, of course, motivations are incredibly complex. Corporate interests in education are extremely diverse and not always compatible: recruitment and retraining of a skilled work force; maintaining a stable community base for business activity; retaining valued employees; obtaining community good-will and gratitude; keeping school-related taxation at reasonable levels; promoting inquiry and research of possible benefit to the corporation, and so forth. Specific corporate actions may sometimes respond directly to the public interest, but, by and large, corporations act out of a perceived self-interest. It may be long-range or short-, enlightened or crass, but self-interest it is. Corporations aim to make profits and are responsible to stockholders who seek just that. Corporations are not eleemosynary institutions.

It seemed important, too, to know how education responded to the corporate interest. There were many reports of imaginative local leadership, and equally many reports of fear, resistance, and ineptness in response. There was also an undertone of opportunism -- that education sought to extract

additional corporate support and cooperation for short-run benefits without understanding the fundamental purposes and possibilities of the corporate response. The educational community evidently needed to discover more widely some commonality of purpose with corporations; it needed to know the long-run corporate interests, how they intersected with the interests of the schools, and how to foster collaborative action.

In the conduct of this review, I was assisted by Sandra Porter and Shirley Robock Fox, staff members at the National Institute for Work and Learning. We gathered and reviewed over 100 pertinent books and articles. Concurrently, we conducted on-site interviews with corporate, educational and civic leaders in 10 large cities (Boston, New York, Chicago, Minneapolis, Cleveland, Atlanta, Miami, Los Angeles, San Francisco and Oakland). We also read detailed reports on, or talked extensively by phone or in person with individuals from 9 additional cities (Dallas, Detroit, Kansas City, San Diego, Pittsburgh, Louisville, New Orleans, Hartford and Washington, DC). In addition, I interviewed the leadership of most major educational associations and several other organizations with an urban or business focus, selected state officials and scholars. In all, we interviewed some 150 persons.

The literature, selected to reflect both corporate and educational perspectives, was unexpectedly lacking in direct commentary on the issue of corporate interest in education. On the other hand, the interviews were rich with the insight of experience. Thus, where I had anticipated that the interviews would enflesh a conceptual structure derived from a published literature, they turned out to be my most solid basis for constructing the structure myself. As a result, the findings reported here can best be described as

impressionistic -- my interpretations of what I saw and heard. They could profit from further corroboration and reflection before they become anyone's gospel.

This review of the corporate interest in the urban public schools should be considered, finally, just part of a broader topic that includes at least two additional, integrally related, aspects: the corporate interest in higher education and the development of education programs within private industry. I touch upon these aspects briefly to draw a few pertinent comparisons with my primary focus on urban precollegiate education; but I have relied in this effort upon the more extensive inquiries of other analysts. Prof. Ernest Lynton's review for the Ford Foundation of the corporate interest in higher education has gone forward somewhat in tandem with this analysis. The area of education in industry has been summed up briskly and competently by two recent reviews by Seymour Lusterman of the Conference Board and Harold Goldstein of the National Institute of Work and Learning. These reviews are listed in the bibliography.

The attached report has several sections. Section I provides a brief historical perspective; Section II, a quick review of the reasons for contemporary corporate interest in education, including a brief scan of the corporate view towards its own education programs, higher education, and the public schools. Section III is a more extended survey of the specifics of the recent corporate response to education problems, including a special section on corporate philanthropy; Section IV turns the coin and describes education's reactions to corporate activity; and Section V contains conclusions and recommendations. Two appendices contain a list of persons contacted and a bibliography.

I

A BRIEF HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

The current round of discussion of the corporate and business interest in public education is just the most recent episode in one of the most fundamental and continuous educational debates of this century. Historians have attended most closely to the emergence of this issue during the late 19th and early 20th centuries; and there is no disagreement about its significance, though its causes and effects are argued over fiercely. In the first two decades of twentieth century American education, several features were set firmly in place:

- as schools proceeded from educating the few to educating the many, two universal themes were the requirement for literate and industrious workers, and for schooling to attend to the experience and prospects of its students. This meant that both education and business leaders settled into the view that education should have, as an important objective, preparing the individual for worklife. The development of vocational education was a specific instance of this trend, and of the involvement of business in it, but by no means the only one.
- business and professional men served as the trustees of the new public school system (dominating school board membership almost to the present day), and were, until the 1950s at least, the most powerful and consistent source of civic support for the schools.
- methods of business management were widely adopted and adapted

by school administrators who defined themselves increasingly as managers in the image of the American businessman.

These currents ran strongly and relatively unchallenged for almost a half century, and had many lasting effects on the nature of curricula, the development of educational testing, placement and counseling programs. It is not too much to say that the business community thought and acted as though it "owned" the schools, until 20-25 years ago. By that time, the corporate trustees who had once been quite critical of local educational programs under their review were quite thoroughly socialized into their role, chummy with the superintendent, a professional manager like themselves, and not critical. Business and education agreed with the maxim that "education should be left to the professional educators, whose business it was." Indeed, as the public educational system accomplished prodigies of building and program expansion in the first two decades after World War II, and began producing very large numbers of qualified recruits for colleges and the labor market, there was little to be critical about.

The pendulum swung swiftly in the mid-to-late 1960s. The political economy of schooling began to shift rapidly, as urban schools became hot political arenas drawing new kinds of well-educated civic activists, interest group representatives and aspiring politicians into educational politics. New issues and contentions were raised. Angry charges were flung at past stewardships, sometimes in strongly-worded anti-business terms. The once placid education profession was fractured; the hegemony of the superintendent ended and teachers organized collectively to bargain. Courts and legislatures began to add mandate after mandate for equal educational opportunity, due process, and better service for previously neglected groups of students. In case after

case, but especially in the large urban systems, the corporate representatives quietly left the scene, or were unceremoniously bumped aside. This is not to say that they were initially hostile to the many changes occurring in the schools or locked into a rigid defense of the past, but that many other parties at interest were moving aggressively into school politics, that the gratifications of the "responsible businessman" in school politics diminished swiftly or disappeared, and that there were plenty of other things for that person (or those persons) to do, professionally and in the community. They could and did, for example, give increasing attention to the emerging problems of higher education. And increasingly, by all reports, they withdrew their own children into the very elite public schools of small suburban enclaves or into private schools. It was just at this juncture, unhappily, that a general disillusionment with the effectiveness and accountability of the schools set in with the public. Declining test scores, unruly students, unworkable innovations, and newly militant teachers -- these became the popular evidence that the schools were "failing," especially in the cities. These sentiments were taken up, and are still held very strongly, by many corporate officials who had little personal contact to soften their emerging stereotype of the schools.

This highly simplified tale helps explain the curious state in which corporate officials found themselves when, during the past several years, they began to develop new concerns about the public schools. They were cut off from the levers of power in the public schools, out of touch with educational leadership, and alienated from some of the educational policies being pursued -- to a degree unprecedented in this century. In this perspective, much of their recent activity has been an attempt to redefine their interest in the public

schools and to rebuild channels of communication and influence. This process has been most prominent and most frustrating in the case of the large city school systems whose troubles have been most startling to business, as to our society as a whole.

The Growing Pressures of Labor Supply: Will They Produce a New Corporate Perspective?

The historical developments described above set the stage for an impending decisive moment in the corporate view of public schools. Predictable demographic changes are beginning to intensify the corporate interest in the schools. Over the next decade, the numbers of persons 14 to 24 years old will diminish by 6.3 million or 14% (from 45 to 39 million persons); high school enrollments and graduates will drop by 20%. Within this overall decline, there will be additional disproportionate declines in cities, relative to suburbs, and in the Northeast-Midwest, relative to the Sun Belt; and a substantial increase in the proportion of urban youth who are minority and disadvantaged. Most analyses conclude, moreover, that higher education and the armed services will be seeking steady or growing numbers of young people. For the first time in a generation there will probably be, in several urban locations, an absolute shortage of labor supply for entry level positions. Urban employers already report great difficulty in locating qualified employees for entry level positions. But in city after city, corporate officials volunteered the following candid analysis of their current practice at the hiring door.

- "Yes, we have been increasingly concerned with the problem of our city schools, but we have been able, basically, to get by excluding their failures. We 'cream' the city schools,

screening 10 applicants to find one qualified. (Sometimes we simply decline to hire anyone under 20, to let age and experience season our prospects.) We use Department of Labor training programs to recover an additional few and to satisfy affirmative action requirements. But our bread and butter recruiting is carried on in the suburban and private high schools, and among women reentering the labor force."

- "What scares us now is that this equilibrium is breaking down. We who are tied to the cities (principally financial institutions, public utilities, and large and small service establishments) cannot compete for recruits with the suburban shopping malls and high technology industries, let alone with the colleges. (Moreover, those of us in the Northeast and Midwest cannot hold either jobs or people, in competition with the South and West). If a way is not found to improve substantially and quickly the proportion of qualified youngsters graduating from the city school systems, we will face unpleasant but unavoidable alternatives: moving job requirements out of the city (or the state, or the nation!); or making capital substitutions for labor (i.e., technological innovation) more quickly or more extensively than we want."

This story has a variation sung by machine parts industries in cities like Cleveland and Milwaukee, who will need thousands of skilled machinists and tool-and-die workers. It also has a counterpoint among high technology firms who fear that too few students will be produced, by <u>all</u> the schools, with the science and math skills needed to insure their international competitive

position in the next decade.

Altogether, these tales suggest that many corporations will make new and more serious decisions affecting the schools over the next several years. Their vital short run interests will be involved in a new way, one that may force the issue upward in the corporate hierarchy, into strategy discussions where it has long, perhaps always, been absent. The question will be: should corporations invest substantial financial and political resources in the rejuvenation of the city schools or should they, however reluctantly, maintain their low expectations of the schools and make the necessary adjustments in corporate policy and activity? The question is serious for the corporations, vital for the schools.

There will undoubtedly be a wide range of answers, for the problem is of varying seriousness, geographically and sectorally. Firms in the old Northeastern and Midwestern cities may be more concerned than those in the South and West. Labor-intensive financial and service institutions will face a greater problem than, say, the capital intensive oil industry, and small organizations a different problem than large. Firms with highly technical skill requirements will hurt in a different way than firms who rely more upon organizational and communications skills. In these circumstances, it will be difficult for corporations to identify mutual interest and forge a common program.

II

THE NATURE OF THE CONTEMPORARY CORPORATE INTEREST

Why are corporations interested nowadays in public education in the cities? And how interested are they?

There seem to be three components to the corporate interest. The first is the continuation of the basic, historic interest in education as the fundamental continuing social enterprise developing skilled and productive citizens. These citizens contribute to business as workers, consumers, and supporters of a democratic free enterprise system. This interest remains a substantial underlying motivation reflected, for example, in a hefty share of corporate giving going to education. It also leads to such specific activities, such as the promotion of "free enterprise education" and "economic education," arising from a long-standing concern that schools devote too little attention to these essential perspectives. It encompasses generalized support for programs of equal educational opportunity, too.

(Interestingly, on the high plane of the "corporate social responsibility" discussions emerging in prominence in the past decade, there has been little mention of special corporate obligations to education. Such issues as environmental impact of corporate operations, affirmative action in employment and quality of work life are the most popular items in such discussions. Some corporate officials say that support for education is a social responsibility of such long standing and constancy that it is taken for granted as an abiding interest that preceded and still stands solidly in the background of the current topical concerns -- as the continued substantial levels of corporate

financial and material support for education demonstrate. Whatever the case, the recent development of new notions of corporate social responsibility does not seem to have had any specific effect on corporate thinking with respect to education.)

A more localized and specific motive is the interest in "corporate citizenship in the community" -- and its corollary, the community as "a good place to do business." This interest leads the corporation to respond to local crises and needs that threaten community stability, or affect the comparative advantage of the community as a locus of operations.* It also gives individual firms a substantial public relations stake in educational activities that garner good will.

The third aspect of corporate interest in education is as an employer of residents from the local labor market and of recruits attracted from elsewhere. Increasingly in recent years this interest also involves the corporation as educator and trainer looking for cost effective ways to provide (either in the community or on its own) technical and managerial skills to its workforce. These interests are reflected in business concern about the basic educational preparation of urban school graduates and in support for the range of career education and similar programs at secondary and postsecondary levels.

How important are these interests? As a matter of doctrine, these interests are essential to business: if there is no universal education system, no

*"Hometown pride" often adds an intensity to this interest, with other more troubled or less favored communities raised up for scornful contrast and civic effect: do you want A (our city) to look like B (the current highly publicized educational trouble spot)?

community stability and favorable business climate, and no adequate supply of labor, there is no way to be successful in business in the long-run.

But this truism does not give educational matters a high priority in corporate decisionmaking; there are many other imperatives to corporate survival. The fact is, corporations do not act as if education has much priority in their calculations. They devote little high level attention to it; it is rarely considered in corporate strategic planning. They spend very little money on it and have, in fact, used public or foundation resources to achieve some of their most famous successes (in Dallas and Chicago, for example). They react more than they take initiative; they take few risks. They give consistent weight to the public relations benefits of their proposed activities; in education, one company president said, "I can't afford a down side."

To some extent, both corporate doctrine and corporate behavior reflect the division of responsibility between business and education that the business community is not eager to reexamine or change. Under this compact, schools would provide general skills and competencies; business, specific job skills. If schools fall short, businesses urge improvement; if schools ask for help, business should try to respond. But business should not intrude into "educational" decisions. This attitude can become a convenient reason for corporations not to act, and for educators to ask for little.

The level and significance of the corporate officials commonly involved is a key indicator of the level and significance of corporate involvement in education. The inference is again very clear: education is not a vital issue. Except for occasional appearances by chief executive officers (hereafter, CEOs) and other senior executives at the beginning of special campaigns

or at special events -- usually in the temporary company of a few other CEOs -- their involvement is rare.

There are exceptions. There are individual executives who have some personal devotion or interest in public education which is reflected in their firm's activities or in community leadership; and their interest is seen as just that -- individual. There are also, in a few communities, groups of senior executives who come together quietly in "roundtable" discussions to provide continuous support to the schools.

But most CEOs are hardly involved at all. As a breed they are by all accounts preoccupied with questions of short-run performance and profits. Raising capital, fast development and marketing of products, acquiring and selling entire corporate properties, dealing with government policies and regulations -- these concerns dominate their days. So one must judge from the content of the periodical literature (i.e., Business Week, Dun's Review, Forbes, Fortune, Harvard Business Review, etc.) and of the programs of their national organizations (e.g., the U.S. Chamber of Commerce), and from the testimony of their subordinates. By such evidence, CEOs pay scarcely any attention to human capital, inside or outside the firm.

Moreover, there are few recurrent events that bring issues of public education into their lives casually or indirectly. Their children are not often in the public schools and almost never in city schools. (In fact, firms often pay executives for private schooling, especially in connection with inter-city transfers.) There are no continuing forums for them to discuss these matters among themselves, and in most communities only infrequent occasions which would bring them in touch with educational leaders (except possibly for

prominent university presidents). Their world, public and private, formal and informal, excludes thought of public education for all practical purposes. In such a milieu, generalized suspicions that "unionization has damaged the schools" or that "schools pay too little attention and respect to the free enterprise system" carry over from related convictions developed in other corporate contexts. Such attitudes can and do persist and dampen the enthusiasm of many corporate leaders.

Who, then, does represent the corporate interest in education? For the most part, the duty is assigned to mid-level managers, often vice-presidents in either the personnel or public affairs offices of the company.* These officials and their staffs carry out the various programs of corporate involvement in education, as one of many duties. They are usually not members of the senior management structure of the firm, although there is sometimes a special channel to the CEO or someone on his immediate staff. Typically there is a sense among these staffers that the attention of the well-meaning CEO cannot be gained; and that their activities in support of education are not welcomed enthusiastically by many other officials in senior operating roles, who see their hard earned profit margins being eaten away by such "inessential" staff activities.

In summary, the doctrine of education's great importance to the flourishing of

---

*There is a commonly expressed lack of effective communication between personnel and public affairs offices pursuing their respective duties in this area. This lack leads many times to a lack of coordination between the development of internal education requirements and programs -- growingly important in corporate life -- with programs seeking to support and improve education in the community. It leads similarly to limited consideration of the possible roles of local educational institutions in the human resource development (HRD) programs that many businesses are now developing.

free enterprise in a democratic society does not engage the attention or energies of the most senior business executives. They are absorbed in other matters, and to the extent they think about education at all, they assign most responsibility, for the problems of schooling and for improvement, to educators who live and work in distant worlds that they rarely encounter. As likely as not, a number of programs are carried out within the organization to express corporate support for education. These programs are indeed helpful to educators, and make the community a bit better place to do business; but they are also risk-free activities that garner consistent public relations benefits for the firm. Controversial educational issues are shunned and intense support for education based upon a high-level executive analysis of short- and long-run corporate requirements is still a rare occurrence. Any significant change in these patterns would require a change in CEOs' perceptions of risks and priorities: a sense that the risks of continuing present policies toward education will be greater than the risks of developing new, more aggressive activities that will serve emerging corporate interests. Also needed will be instances of statesmanship: leading corporate executives who can enlighten and guide their colleagues.

Two Real Invidious Comparisons

Public education, moreover, suffers continually by a series of unfavorable comparisons with the two other principal aspects of corporate educational activities, education programs carried on within the corporation, and dealings with higher education. In comparison with education programs created by and for industries, the urban public schools are viewed as having one or several of the following shortcomings:

- o not producing enough basically prepared employees
- o likely to fall successively further behind on this score, as jobs' technical requirements increase
- o unable to adapt the substance or method of instruction, as corporations have done, for example, in using new educational technologies and self-pacing curricula
- o unenthusiastic about business involvement in the schools
- o unwilling to be held accountable or judged on any cost-effectiveness grounds

In comparison with higher education, the public schools also compare poorly, on the corporate scales. Corporate officials usually observe that:

- o the typical college graduate is more satisfactorily prepared for technical or managerial assignments than his or her counterpart with a high school diploma seeking work at the entry level.
- o a generation of recruiting, supporting research, working with university consultants and steady corporate giving and service to higher education have developed an array of productive (if sometimes awkward) relationships between business and the university -- which do not have counterparts with the elementary and secondary schools. Corporate officials are, in consequence, far more comfortable dealing with institutions of higher education than with elementary and secondary schools; they understand the higher education process better, identify more with its product, and find contacts with it more readily gratifying.
- o support of the private colleges and universities is seen as a special obligation of the private business sector and receives

much corporate philanthropic support, whereas the public schools, it is thought, should be supported strictly by taxes (including corporate taxes).

What is more, in the case of community colleges, corporate officials note a striking contrast in behavior, and a potential alternative to some of the most relevant functions of the public schools. Community colleges alone among the major sectors of education have given explicit and high priority to corporate needs. They often create, redesign, and relocate courses to suit the business clientele; they are increasingly the sponsors of the best vocational and technical education programs; they participate enthusiastically in many state and regional economic development strategies, promising appropriate educational support for new businesses; they sometimes offer special planning and guidance services to small businesses and their employees; they consider no educational need brought to them by the community to be above or beneath them.

Presented as stark contrasts, these points of invidious comparisons may be somewhat overdrawn. And they are certainly unfair to the public schools, to the extent that they ignore or underrate (as corporations sometimes do) the difference in clientele, in incentives and motivational structures, and in the degree of professional autonomy and control--which make the public schools' problems greater and solutions more difficult. Rightly or wrongly, though, they play their part in intensifying the negative light in which corporations often hold the urban schools.

A Note on Small Business

All that has been said in this section about the corporate interest in education applies generally to the world of small business, too. There are, to be sure, important differences. Small businesses start and fail more often than large firms; and usually have higher turnover of management staff. Labor market forecasts say that most new jobs in the 1980s will be created in small businesses, but that a large proportion of those jobs will be semi-skilled and low paying jobs characterized by continuing high turnover and limited opportunities for advancement. Thus, small businesses have and will have substantial employment needs. At the same time, they have fewer resources for recruitment and training and thus rely more on the specific (though not sophisticated) skills of a limited pool of applicants. Accordingly, they have less flexibility and can be affected more adversely by the shortcomings of local school systems. They have often ended up more negative than their corporate counterparts in their outlook toward public education. They, too, have given the matter little priority and participate only sporadically in programs of support and assistance.

There are great organizational and communication problems involved in mobilizing small business activities supporting education, but there are signs of readiness. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and its Small Business Council, and some representatives of urban constituencies, are recognizing there must be a match between the needs and capabilities of city youngsters, on the one hand, and the development of new jobs in small businesses, with continual personal supervision, on the other. Community colleges and local chambers of commerce are learning how to collect and satisfy the educational needs of small business. The small business community may soon join the dialogue more fully.

III

THE EMERGING CORPORATE RESPONSE

The details and the timing of the corporate world's awakening interest in the plight of public education has differed from city to city around the country, but it seems to have common stimuli, to emerge from a broad set of changing corporate interests, and to have eventuated in similar patterns and sequences of new activity. Individual differences amongst localities seem to be determined mostly by historical factors unique to the locality or by the ability and initiative of educational leadership in mobilizing and channeling the resources of the business community. The succeeding sections will try to suggest some of the richness and complexity of these processes, even while trying to shoehorn them into one analytical mold.

Identifying the Problem

The corporate "withdrawal" from public education has ended and been reversed in city after city during the past several years, for one or both of two reasons: a traumatic crisis in the local schools and/or a perception of swiftly declining levels of educational achievement. The crises were often precipitated by the prospect or process of desegregation (for example, in Dallas, Chicago, Boston, Detroit, Cleveland, Los Angeles) sometimes accompanied by violence and civic unrest. In other cases, the stimulus was more directly a perceived or imminent "collapse" of educational standards and outcomes (such themes being more prominent in such communities as New York, Atlanta, New Orleans, Oakland and Pittsburgh, for instance).

But in every case the issue today is expressed over and over again as quality -- the lack of which shows up most strikingly in the recruitment for entry level jobs. Corporate executives in every city visited bemoaned the deterioration of educational achievement in their city's schools in the past decade. They say that few graduates qualify for available jobs. Some say that one applicant in ten is qualified. Most say that the technical requirements of their jobs are rising, so that the gap between requirements and preparation is growing.

What would constitute acceptable "quality"? At a general level, the answer is quite consistent across the land, and could be characterized as "basic skills plus". The basic skills are identified as general skills of reading, writing and computing sufficient to master the technical aspects of entry level jobs, to learn successively more complex tasks over time, and to communicate effectively and exercise good judgment on the job. This is not a narrow "3-R's" conception of the basic educational skills. Nor is it a call for schools to concentrate on providing specific job skills; most corporations believe that they can and should best do this themselves. The call is rather for a set of general though basic skills that are often summed up under such rubrics as "functional literacy" or "employability."

What else is called for:

- o broad preparation in career education seen as a curriculum and school program that tries, as an important objective of students' educational activities, to help define options and skills for adult performance, especially in the workplace. Vocational education is sometimes incorporated into this

instrumental perspective -- one way to furnish many students with basic skills and a sense of vocation.* Greater coordination with business, labor and parents and more programmatic contact with the world outside of school are frequently mentioned as significant new emphases, to the same end, needed thoughout the schools.

- o accountability in the educational system. Most businessmen call for the educational equivalent of a "bottom line" -- clearer measures of the educational effectiveness of the system (and of individual educators) as well as reliable specification of the level of preparation of individual students. Thus, there is strong support for competency testing programs for students and teachers.
- o better preparation in science and mathematics. For an important slice of American industry centering in the high technology area but including parts of many industrial and commercial

---

*The picture one gains of high school vocational education programs in various cities is inconsistent and puzzling. A quarter or more of American high school students participate mainly in vocational curricula. Yet many corporate officials seemed to be barely aware of any distinctive role for such programs, or to be aware of one or two highly visible projects ballyhooed as "new" vocational programs for the city.

In many urban systems, vocational educators feel, their programs have long been neglected and have achieved too little identity and effectiveness. It is also undoubtedly the case that many of the channels from vocational programs to jobs are direct, of long standing, and well submerged in both education and employment systems -- beneath the view of top executives. Other observers note, though, that the specific skills imparted by vocational education are necessarily out-of-date in a swiftly changing job market. They are welcome "gifts" to the employer (especially the small businessman) in individual cases, but are, in this analysis, largely subordinate in overall educational significance to the more basic intellectual skills that every entry level worker must have.

activities, preparation in science and mathematics constitutes a special objective above and beyond basic skills. These businesses have especially high technical requirements for employment. They see themselves on the cutting edge of productivity advances, worry about foreign competition, and believe that the Japanese and others are preparing better technical workers in their schools.

All these corporate objectives for education are squarely in the mainstream of contemporary American public opinion concerning education, where basic skills are seen as the most important objective of instruction. Every recent survey of students and youth indicates, moreover, that getting and holding a decent job is to them, as to the public at large, the most important single ambition and justification of schooling -- and growing more important in their minds. College students, in both two- and four-year institutions, have for ten years been gravitating toward professional or vocational programs until today there are two out of three thus enrolled. By the same token, accountability is not the lonely plaint of corporate officials. It has been a dominant theme of educational policymaking in federal programs, in state lawmaking and in most communities.

Furthermore, the corporate perspective contains an awareness that equal educational opportunity is a continuing educational desideratum, on practical as well as constitutional grounds. Business leaders are coming to share the contemporary educational value that pursuit of work-related objectives should never become an excuse to foreclose any student's option prematurely (this being a perspective which organized labor will always spotlight and defend).

The corporate interest in educational quality is, in sum, not distinctively "corporate," but simply part of a broad convergence of popular educational opinion. When the corporations speak for themselves, then, they can speak for many others.

An Evolving Pattern of Response

Starting perhaps from fear or concern for their society, or for their business or for both, but ending up with a legitimate and substantial basis in educational concerns, new corporate programs relating to the urban public schools have developed steadily, in number and in kind, during the past decade.

There have been at least three developments within the education and training activities of corporations that should be kept in mind, as context for the unfolding pattern of external activity:

- The gradual growth of a human resource development (HRD) perspective in corporate personnel and training policies. HRD activities reflect an emerging sense that workers will be less and less interchangeable in the corporate future, even as they may be more and more mobile; and that their long-run development and retention is an indispensible part of corporate policies. This notion is gradually increasing the significance of the once technical personnel function and suggesting -- not yet very widely or successfully -- that the development of human capital is an important objective of corporate planning and strategy.
- the manifold expansion of technical education and training programs. Such programs are, by and large, the inevitable consequence of the greater technical complexity of jobs, the

specificity of many technical requirements and rapid change therein. These are not circumstances that business expects schools to be able to respond to directly and specifically. Indeed, they have had the unforeseen consequence of reinforcing the conviction that corporate leadership should emphasize greater quality in the schools' basic academic and vocational programming, leaving the often extensive specific training requirements until the student arrives at the workplace.

- o the development of remedial basic skills instruction for entering employees. Many businesses, especially such large labor-intensive corporations as banks and insurance companies, report the growth of such programs. Many feel that such programs are quite successful; and yet they resent the necessity of sustaining them and insist that the schools must not be relieved of their responsibility. The exact extent of these programs is difficult to gauge, since some remediation is involved in many conventional training activities; estimates range from 1% to 8% of corporate educational expenditures. Typically these are among the least expensive training programs. Their significance is enhanced in the corporate folklore, though, because they are instances where corporations have succeeded with the schools' failures.

Against this backdrop of internal developments, corporate relationships with the schools have progressed through four kinds of activities, each representing a new stage in involvement:

- o new processes for communication and collaboration,
- o more and more extensive "helping hand" programs in the local schools,
- o management assistance activities,
- o expeditions into school politics.

Collaborative Arrangements

New processes of communication and collaboration were badly needed after the ruptures in corporate-school relationships during the 60s.

The most common form of renewed communication has been the local collaborative organization, usually called the Education-Work Council or Industry-Education-Labor Council. These social inventions of the 1970s are autonomous action-oriented organizations where government, business, labor, community-based organizations and education seek to identify and address shared problems in education and the transition to work, as equal partners. The notion of "partners" is important because it suggests that no one party is in charge, and that success depends on mutual concern and effort. These councils have been quite carefully developed and tested in over 100 cities. Their progress has been carefully documented. Whether or not their action programs are earthshaking, these councils have provided the beginning of new relationships between the local leadership of business and education.

Collaborative councils have not been the only new contacts. Many have occurred through the education-related activities of CETA Private Industry Councils, through the unilateral expansion of Chamber of Commerce education committees, through the revival of business participation on school advisory councils, or through the formation of quite exclusive "round tables" of

business executives for private deliberations with the local educational leadership.

"Helping Hand" Programs

Under the umbrella of expanded forms of collaboration, the private business community usually embarks over a period of time upon several varieties of "helping hand" activities. These activities were often launched under the rubric of "career education" which, after its introduction by U. S. Commissioner of Education Sidney P. Marland in the early 1970s, was seized upon in community after community as the opportunity for the business community to express its new interest in education. Prominent kinds of expanded activities include:

- o provision of business-related materials (e.g., booklets, audio-visual packets) to be used in existing courses, such as social studies, ecology, or communications, or in expanded offerings of economic education or "free enterprise" studies. A long-standing expression of business interest in the schools, such activities are sometimes criticized for a bias toward a particular industry or toward the whole private sector, or toward management vis-a-vis labor. They represent free goods to the schools and have traditionally been accepted uncritically and presumably used as convenient curricular supplements.
- o provision of career-oriented information to students -- through career expositions or fairs, systematic programs of speakers or teachers from private business, industry tours for students, as well as new instruction for guidance counselors and teachers in local career opportunities.

- participation in work experience programs: businesses have cooperated widely in school-arranged programs such as work study, cooperative education, and internships. Again, the numbers are deceptive: only 1% of high school students participate in formal programs of this sort; but they are looked upon as good job prospects by the participating firms, and the program is seen as a source of good will in the community.

The most recently popular form of business assistance, the Adopt-a-School or Partnership programs, moves beyond the career education format. Though they often retain a career- or business-oriented flavor, the Adopt-a-School programs are broader in purpose, and they engage the individual firms and the business communities in a new type of commitment.

In form, they consist of one business "adopting" one school, with the partners then forging a set of activities whereby the business helps improve or enrich the school program, usually through educational projects or management assistance.* From the business perspective, Adopt-a-School brings identification of a business with the success of a particular school -- a step that brings both risk and opportunity. So far the risks have been few and the opportunities great, for gratifying personal contact and for community good will. From a school system perspective, the program usually has a district-wide ambition to have all or most of the schools (or the secondary schools) adopted by a business -- thus establishing a broad and highly public program of support for the school program. In Dallas, Los Angeles, New Orleans, Memphis and Oakland,

---

*There are a few instances of several small businesses "sharing" a school.

such breadth has nearly been accomplished; in other cities, such as Minneapolis, Boston, and Chicago, Adopt-a-School programs have been tried and have had transitory or indifferent success (but Chicago is, at this very time, trying again). Within each school district, moreover, there are ambitious and successful Adopt-a-School programs offering extensive program enrichment -- and there are programs offering little more than recreational opportunities. Moreover, new modes of cooperative action are springing up continually: in Memphis, churches as well as business firms are "adopting" schools; in Washington, D.C. last month, five national corporations pledged $1 million to help the school system develop career foci in the programs of five high schools.

There has been no evaluation of the Adopt-a-School program and there is a slightly unsettling "boosterism" among its enthusiasts who shy away from models or criteria. But there is enough anecdotal evidence of success and of its ingredients (such as an enthusiastic principal and a dedicated CEO) that many school systems are moving to launch or expand Adopt-a-School programs.

One last variant of the "helping hand" recently launched in a few urban systems has been participation in financing local school improvement programs. Under such programs small corporation contributions are pooled with other gifts by a local institution, which then sets up a process for school personnel to compete for small awards. A variety of means are used: the San Francisco Educational Fund collects and distributes grants for classroom programs throughout the city; the Allegheny Conference on Economic Development furnishes mini-grants to almost 100 innovative Pittsburgh teachers; the Washington Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights under Law has arranged for

business-financed challenge grants to parents' groups at twelve individual schools in Washington, D.C. These foundations for school improvement are attractive in focusing on specific initiatives originating in individual schools and classrooms and yet helping the individual business avoid judging the merit of each proposal. Their corollary disadvantage is that they diminish the identification of particular corporations with particular schools or programs. The most exciting aspect of these local school improvement programs is the much needed example of useful ways in which corporations can contribute some limited philanthropic resources to elementary and secondary education in the form of badly needed and highly effective marginal resources.

All in all the various corporate activities of the last ten years helping specific school programs have had several benefits. They have undoubtedly been of some assistance to the students (though this is a widely unevaluated assumption); and they do not seem to have had any significant side effects in distorting curricula or contributing to premature closure of students' options. They have clearly benefited businesses and the school systems. They have been, by and large, excellent community relations programs at modest corporate cost and with little risk. And they have provided the opportunity for thousands of private businesspersons to become reacquainted with the schools. Stereotypes of unruly students, feckless teachers and bumbling administrators have begun to dissolve. There is today among corporate officials a growing realism in understanding the problems of the urban schools. Not that the business community is ready to applaud. Not at all; they are more critical than not. But they now understand that the problem lies in the educational systems and their urban surroundings -- in their mission, their financing, their political leadership, their managerial capacity -- not in the

alleged incompetence or irresponsibility of their professional staffs.

And thus corporate officials are also coming to understand that the solution -- and the business role in the solution -- lies beyond the "helping hand" approach, in varieties of assistance that address the systemic problems of the schools. This dawning draws business to new levels of concern and activity with respect to management, financing, and policy-making in the city schools.

Management Assistance

Management assistance is one of the most natural and least risky forms of business involvement, and every urban school system has examples during the past decade of such assistance, often in the forms of loaned executives, to improve budgeting, financial management, inventory control, and facilities utilization of the district. Most businessmen say, though, that school administrators have sought such assistance sporadically, at best, and have as often as not ignored or failed to use the corporate assistance once provided. The educators' response, of course, is that advice drawn from the experience of the private sector is often bureaucratically naive and ill-adapted to the administrative realities of school systems. This area of seemingly natural collaboration is thus, ironically, one of the recurrent sources of misunderstanding and frustration.

In a few recent cases, the management issue has taken on a new significance as a system-wide corporate priority for improving school performance. The most notable example of this is Chicago where the corporate community's Chicago United last year formed a task force of 85 loaned executives, plus educational consultants, for four months of analysis of the school system's programs in

instructional management. This $2-3 million of free management consulting eventuated in a 100-page report with some 250 recommendations for improvement. Beyond its unprecedented scope, the Chicago United effort also reflected an unusual strategic sophistication. It was clearly the view of the task force's founders that the long term financial health of the system was the fundamental interest being advanced by this study. Educational management needed improvement for its own sake to be sure, but also for the system to retrieve the confidence of the legislature and tax payers, in order ultimately to receive the monies necessary for financial survival.

Thus do corporations, in Chicago and elsewhere, arrive at contemporary corporate involvement in urban school politics.

Ventures into School Politics

In every city, both corporation officials and educators reported that the political activity and influence of the corporate community in educational affairs had diminished one to two decades ago, as new social issues and new actors entered the scene. Still, local business communities remained powerful sources of influence. In regional commercial centers like Atlanta, Dallas, Seattle, Cincinnati, and Minneapolis, active corporate communities had unusual influence that continued to extend to the schools. Here the links were never broken. In other places, like Boston, New Orleans, Miami and San Francisco, the connection was historically less significant and, in recent times, quite weak indeed. In other places, like Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland and Los Angeles, the corporate interest has been less uniformly expressed, waxing and waning from one year to another. And New York, finally, has the particular problem of a preponderance of national and multinational headquarters, whose

sights are usually focused far beyond education in that city and whose interest is difficult to fathom.

The decision to be involved in the political support (or criticism) of urban schools is difficult to make. Politics involves conflict and risk. To be involved, corporate leaders must reassure themselves that there is a substantial corporate interest, since public relations benefits can not be assured. They must also decide which of their interests are most important: good schools and lower taxes may not be compatible objectives, for instance.

It seems clear that no such widespread corporate calculation and commitment has yet been made. There are interesting isolated examples of new corporate involvement in educational policymaking, but they do not a pattern make.

- in Detroit, San Francisco and other communities, corporate officials have participated prominently in the ambitious but usually disappointing activities of blue-ribbon commissions set up to restore vigor to the schools under third-party auspices.
- in Minneapolis, the business community has raised $100,000 to pay for a comprehensive planning process for the school system, designed to intensify community-wide participation in educational policy development.
- in Los Angeles, the Chamber of Commerce has commissioned (at over $25,000) an economic analysis of the financial needs of the school district, as a prelude to developing its own political position on issues of school finance and accountability.
- in New Orleans and Cincinnati small business roundtables of CEOs have, at the superintendent's request, quietly but successfully

helped put across tax levies for the schools.

- o in Chicago, the business community took the lead recently in putting together an 11-person school board slate, appointed in toto by the mayor.
- o in Dallas and Pittsburgh, business has fostered and assisted, with money and expertise, public information programs to make the schools' case to the community.
- o in the states of California, Florida and Minnesota there have been initial efforts to bring together the business community statewide, to provide political support in the schools, with the accent on better financing with better accountability.
- o in Seattle the business community was instrumental in the development and implementation of the nation's outstanding (only) example of a voluntary and comprehensive desegregation plan.

The last example stands in some contrast to the others and highlights thereby the difficulties business communities have had in dealing with education's toughest political controversies. Several of the cities studied have come under court-ordered desegregation plans, but only in a few has the business community been able to furnish vigorous and effective support of the plan. In Boston and Cleveland, corporate involvement with the public schools has been part of the court-ordered activities, but has not been translated into effective corporate support for the court-ordered plans. In fact, in both these cities, many events involved in the desegregation process seem to have demoralized the corporate supporters of education. In other places, like Los Angeles and Chicago, where desegregation has been a burning issue for most

of the past two decades, the business community has been in and out of the drawn-out discussions but has not been able to devise, agree upon, or promote any solutions.

The point is not that corporations oppose desegregation or racial equality. It is rather two other realities: corporations cannot always agree on what should be done in such volatile political circumstances, and they are often unwilling, individually or collectively, to pay the price of outspoken political leadership on the controversial issues in urban education. There were no generous accolades being handed out to corporate leaders who tried to exert leadership and few followers gathering behind them. Before long few were inclined to lead. In general, in the controversial and divisive issues of urban education, business has seldom sought or played a central role.

The partial and selective nature of corporate involvement also reflects some other attitudes. Many corporate officials believe that little improvement is possible in the cities' schools and that a greater corporate commitment would be simply quixotic. More than a few others believe that the public schools should play a reduced role in the community: that vouchers for all or part of the educational program are a good idea. In a similar vein, the National Urban League reports a revived interest by corporate leadership in the NUL's street academies -- that is, urban alternatives to a public school system -- as a better bet for corporate support than the public school systems themselves. To say the least, the corporations are in no rush to get on the bandwagon of political support for the schools.

Corporate Philanthropy in Education

Patterns of corporate giving to education provide additional evidence concerning the nature and intensity of corporate interest and of the imminence of change therein.

The justification, if any, of corporate philanthropy has been one of the livelier continuing arguments in the literature on corporate responsibility. Should corporations give at all? If so, should giving be tied to basic corporate interests or reflect a broader responsibility? Should giving decisions be made reactively -- or with more planning and sense of strategy and according to more careful standards of review? The general consensus of opinion is that giving should be used to: improve the community in ways that serve the interest of the corporation and its employees; sponsor activities that improve public opinion and attitudes towards business; and, in some cases, exercise a broader, individual sense of social responsibility. These criteria are quite similar to those supporting the general corporate interest in education. It is thus no surprise that a substantial amount of corporate giving goes to education.

From 1968 to 1978, corporate giving climbed from $1 billion to $2 billion overall, but remained about level in real terms, as a proportion of net income before taxes (1%) and as a proportion of the nation's total charitable contributions (5%). Contributions to education have been a steady 35-40% of corporate giving and are expected to reach $1 billion for the first time this year.* Health and welfare programs (including United Way) take another

---

*There are additional in-kind contributions to education, in equipment and some services.

35-40%, while cultural and civic organizations capture 10% each. Most observers see little likelihood of a sizable real dollar increase in corporate giving. Campaigns like Dayton-Hudson's 5% Club have boosted a few individual programs; and there have been sizable increments to giving from the enormous increase in profits of the large oil companies; but, in general, the profit-squeeze and need for capital investment will keep giving patterns down and will probably keep that 80% of the firms who give nothing at all solidly in that category. The anticipated cutbacks in government social programs have already intensified competition for the nod of the few substantial givers. It remains to be seen whether or not the cutbacks will increase their propensity to give.

Two further developments have been frequently discussed: the professionalization of giving activities and the desirability of participating in consortia for giving. Professionalization appears to be well under way, especially in the larger programs. Its effects include improved planning and review processes; more systematic involvement of senior management teams in giving decisions and a probable closer connection with basic corporate objectives.

Consortia in giving are, on the other hand, more often discussed than accomplished. It is clear to most corporate philanthropoids that the lack of size and focus to their individual gifts and those of their colleagues leads to enormous inefficiency in their application to society's needs. Many schemes have been advanced to bring resources together to focus on specific needs, but, except for United Way, there are only scattered instances of persistent success. Corporations seem to resist pooling for several reasons:

- o it loosens control and therefore adds risk

- o it reduces visibility and therefore credit with the community
- o it diminishes the sense of pride and participation that employees may gain from the giving program

Nevertheless, the need for coordinated approaches and the search for acceptable means thereunto continues.

In this overall setting, the minute proportion of corporate contributions to elementary and secondary education, public or private, is startling. No more than 3-5% of the $1 billion now given to education annually goes to precollegiate institutions; only a handful of giving programs have any explicit focus in this area. Seventy percent will go to colleges and universities in unrestricted or special purpose grants; 10% will go directly to students on scholarship in colleges and universities; and the remainder to miscellaneous purposes including the support of developments in economic and free-enterprise education.

Why so little to precollegiate education? There seem to be several answers:

- o Over the past generation, at least, many corporations have developed patterns and methods of giving to higher education. Assisted by their own creation, the Council for Financial Aid to Education (CFAE) with its famous motto, "Give to the College of Your Choice," hundreds of corporations have developed programs to stimulate and match their employees contributions to colleges and universties, as well as numerous other ways to channel support. In this regard, they feel a particular obligation toward the many private institutions, who have less public subvention and would perish without private support.

They have also found it convenient to supplement their contractual research with these institutions with research grants. Serving often on boards of trustees, recruiting continuously, and in general looking to colleges and universities to reproduce their particular roles in the social division of labor, executives give corporate funds cheerfully, almost, to institutions of higher education.

- The corporate attitude toward precollegiate giving could hardly be in greater contrast. The view is widely expressed that corporations cannot be expected to help elementary and secondary schools financially: they are publicly supported through taxes, which the corporations also pay; and money to them would go into a "bottomless pit" of financial needs and would not do any good anyway, since the public schools are almost impossible to improve. Corporate leadership has never mounted a campaign to spur corporate giving to the lower schools, nor developed any comfortable methods for doing so.

There are some very recent indications that these attitudes may be changing. Some corporate executives are coming to appreciate the serious direct relationship between their corporate self-interest and the improvement of public schools. Moreover, the thousands of business people engaged in career education and partnership programs have greater understanding and sympathy for the problems of public education. There are scattered instances, as noted above, of pooled resources for local school improvement programs. Some corporations are broadening the eligibility requirements of their matching-gift programs for employees to include pre-collegiate institutions. There

are reports, at least, that some sizable corporate giving programs are contemplating greater focus on public education. And there is, finally, in the Adopt-a-School programs and some school improvement efforts a budding awareness that public schools are not entirely "bottomless pits"; that corporate funds, in very small amounts, can have important effects in the schools and benefit to the corporation as well. Continued increase in the focus and extent of corporate philanthropic attention to the public schools would be a significant harbinger of new corporate attitudes in the making.

As Things Stand Today: A Summary

After a decade of growing alarm and renewed attention to the schools, the pattern of corporate activity has become fairly clear. It is preponderantly local in focus and has consisted of: expanding levels of participation in collaborative and consultative organizations; more and more ambitious and extensive "helping hand" projects focussing on programmatic developments in individual schools; and a variety of management assistance activities for district and school managers. These activities express rather well the limits of existing corporate policy. They are carried on with varying effectiveness, case by case, but they have had the widespread effect of reintroducing business and education interests, and of developing in the corporate participants a sober realism about the problems of schools.

Ironically but instructively, none of the corporate activities -- programmatic, managerial, or political -- bear directly on their fundamental concern with basic skills and achievement levels. These are quintessentially "educational" matters. They involve curriculum and pedagogical decisions, and system-wide policy commitment and implementation. Corporations have no

alternative, ultimately, to reposing confidence (and resources) in educators to accomplish the most central tasks of schooling. Yet this is a confidence they do not have. This is their deepest frustration.

Gradually but inevitably, corporate attention is being drawn from short-run operational concerns to the more fundamental problems of governing and financing schools. This progress is uneven, at best. The corporations must contemplate both economic and political costs not previously envisioned, often in the absence of a clear cut notion of how such activities fit into larger corporate strategies. They also must devise effective courses of action with respect to educational institutions in great difficulty, whose ways are yet strange and whose political context seems danger-filled. How will they react? They do not yet know.

IV

HOW DO EDUCATORS RESPOND?

The response of educators to corporate needs and initiatives forms a near-perfect complement to the corporate attitudes and behaviors. Like most corporate leaders, most educators have given this matter little priority. In their pursuit of basic educational quality, they receive encouragement and advice from many quarters, and the corporate input has not always been the most compelling or consistent. Beset by additional crises of finance, desegregation, disruptive behavior in the schools, teacher militance and prescriptive government programs, to name a common few, educators have had limited energy and inclination to seek and use new modes of corporate involvement.

Nor did the educators' state of mind conduce to the most enthusiastic embrace of would-be corporate partners:

- a decade of heavy criticism, much of it from the business community, made educators skeptical of initial offers of help.
- educators were, further, leery of being saddled with another unrealistic mission (i.e., reversing the relative decline in worker productivity), which they would be unable to fulfill.
- by professional training and experience, many educators were not adequately equipped to perceive and grasp opportunities for corporate collaboration and assistance.
- by long standing habit of mind, educators tended to channel expressions of corporate interest into vocational and, recently, career education activities -- keeping them on the fringes,

at best, of basic educational programs.

- o educators were often patently more interested in corporate help with new resources than new ideas (and projects thus had a way of disappearing without a trace if corporate assistance ended).
- o not surprisingly, then, when budgets had to be cut, new programs to stimulate corporate involvement often felt the ax first.

Behind these defenses and distrusts, there are more fundamental constraints and reservations that educators feel. There is a profound difference in educational emphasis, between the child-centered educator who feels him/herself engaged in a developmental process which has value in and of itself, and a corporate official who, without wishing to negate education's broader objectives, nevertheless is primarily interested in the employable skills that it produces. Any cooperative efforts involve a balancing of these emphases, and educators have not always been confident of their ability to sustain the balance in the face of corporate influence. They have thus been properly cautious in their pursuit of corporate assistance. Moreover, educators have come to understand the persistent limits of corporate assistance. Businesses must usually be asked, and asked nicely, before they agree to help. In helping, moreover, they will seek noncontroversial activities, public relations benefits and limited costs. The question of job commitments, for instance, is a question of growing significance as career education, Adopt-a-School and similar programs are implemented and the students involved ask: what is the "bottom line" for them? Is someone in the community committed to furnishing them a job opportunity? This is a commitment that corporations usually avoid. The business community has not always seemed to educators a towering bulwark of assistance and support.

In the past few years, though, there has begun a subtle shift in educators' attitudes and behavior. There has been gradual discovery of an expanding common ground of educational goals and objectives. The once wide difference between developmental and instrumental objectives has been narrowed by several far-reaching trends:

- o the development of more complex corporate notions of basic skills and competencies, which comprehend many of the notions of flexibility, readiness for further education and training, problem solving and skills in personal relations that educators have long prized as developmental accomplishments.
- o the growing dominance of broad vocational and career objectives in the educational demands of students.
- o the concurrent development, among critics and educators, of the belief that schools had become too isolated from society, especially the workplaces, to the detriment of the students and the schools.
- o the persistent problems of youth unemployment, driving home to both educators and businessmen the critical importance of helping youth, from the early 'teen years onward, to enter the labor market successfully.
- o the emerging conviction among school leadership that, in the face of persistently "soft" political support for the schools from their traditional taxpaying clientele, the business sector is an obvious, indeed indispensible, source of new civic support for the revitalization of schools, albeit one that needs to be wooed carefully.

This sense of common cause has been reflected most vigorously in the activity of today's crop of urban superintendents. This realistic and capable group believe that what corporations ask in basic student achievement is entirely justified, and they know how desperately important the question of jobs (or lack thereof) has become to the motivation and performance of many of their students. They have taken much of the initiative in the creation of career education, work experience and Adopt-a-School programs in many urban centers. They are managerial in outlook and deal comfortably with other managers. They welcome corporate assistance in managing their systems almost unreservedly. They understand the potency, and necessity, of strong corporate support for their schools and have encouraged many of the roundtables and other cooperative corporate efforts launched in behalf of many urban systems. In short, they know they need help and they have learned how to ask.

Often, it must be said, the superintendent's efforts are, like the business executive's, more personal than systematic. Staff support is often confined to a few persons in the school headquarters, out of the chain of command; and superintendents often confess to greater difficulty securing the cooperation of their subordinates in the school community than the assistance of the business community.

Other components of education leadership are just beginning to appreciate the need and benefit of new corporate support for the schools. With the conspicuous but predictable exception of the American Vocational Association, none of the national educational organizations has emphasized this issue in the recent past. The National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, the associations of local and state school boards, the Chief

State School Officers -- none of these organizations has given much consideration to, or stated any policy on, corporate involvement in education. Likewise, educational researchers and policy analysts have given the issue scant notice.

The national education leaders have recently begun to bring the issue into focus. They realize that the schools must take a good part of the responsibility for their isolation from the business community, and for their continuing inability to bridge the gap consistently and effectively. They have come together in the past few months to begin discussing the future of education in such relevant contexts as national economic productivity, reindustrialization and defense preparedness, and the necessary contribution of human capital development (i.e., education) to all such achievements. They are, one suspects, about to discover the corporate interest in a big way.

V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The stage seems to be set for a rather clear-cut decision across the business community regarding whether or not to launch more intensive political and civic efforts to improve public education, especially in the large cities. There has been at least a decade of steady development in programs and perspective, and the inclination to help the schools improve is still strong, but the corporations are not clear about what more should be done. Doubts persist among corporate officials about the ability of urban educational systems to make substantial improvements in the public schools, at whatever cost. Corporations are reluctant to make commitments of greater resources (financial or human) or promises of future obligations to provide jobs, and they fear that more overt and vigorous political activity will backfire against corporate interests.

Looking at the educators and policy makers in the urban school systems, corporate executives can discern a growing awareness that the legitimate interests of business, education, and the public are converging -- providing common ground for action pursuing such worthy goals as literacy and employability for every student, through means that need not stratify students or foreclose their options prematurely. To be sure, many educators remain hesitant, and some are suspicious and cynical. Many need more experience or training before they explore the full potential of shared interests, but the same can be said of their corporate counterparts. The willingness of corporate interests to lend the "helping hand" is widely appreciated. It has not gone unnoticed, certainly, that corporate representatives often search

instinctively for the non-controversial and for public credit, and hang back from making difficult or expensive commitments, such as jobs for graduates.

Nevertheless, the leaders of urban public education are eager, they say, to devise new programmatic activities and policy-making processes that will furnish their corporate counterparts with specific opportunities to improve the cities' school systems, on the basis of mutual self-interest.

There is the rub. What self-interest can be identified that would impel substantial additional investments of corporate resources (political as well as financial) in support of public education? At first glance, the growing corporate interest in better urban schools seems manifest. Entry level skill requirements encompass a broader and broader array of basic competencies that only schools are set up to provide. Yet, the educational preparation of many individual students is inadequate to current job requirements -- and more so to likely future requirements. Remedial programs at the vestibule of employment only help a limited number of these inadequately prepared young people, and the quantity of young entrants will be insufficient for the next decade, at least for enterprises anchored in our urban centers.

The question is: will the emerging realities demonstrate, once and for all, the irreducible significance of the public schools to the health of corporate activity in our cities? Or will they suggest a difficult but ultimately transitional problem for corporations to "bridge" to technological solutions or new business locations that will reduce their dependence, once and for all, on the entry-level skills of the public school students of our cities? Absent an answer to this question, there is no compelling reason to predict any change in the drift of present corporate policies of benign yet marginal concern.

The hoped-for answer affirming the schools could come in two forms: compelling evidence of the specific economic benefits of a more adequately skilled labor force in the cities; or a broad new appreciation of the contribution of well-educated persons, at every level, to the productivity and profitability of business. In all truth, to most corporate observers, neither answer seems inevitable or near at hand.

There are reasonable self-interested bases for greater involvement, but they need more confirmation and considered attention throughout the nation's corporate leadership, if they are to have a chance of becoming compelling bases for action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The courses of action suggested below all take matters in directions where, hopefully, many of the interested parties are already headed, and try only to add consistency and momentum. Some aim at encouraging leadership; some try to improve local program performance; some try to provide an on-going capacity for analysis and reflection. Taken together (as they should be), they are intended to produce a more energetic, effective and influential corporate involvement in education. They are put forward, let it be clear, on the assumption that such involvement can and will be used by educators to strengthen school programs and achievements in ways that are now sought by all.

In each case the recommendation is stated generally, argued briefly, and exemplified by one or more specific courses of action.

1. Engage corporate decision makers in a reconsideration of the corporate interest in urban schools, as a necessary prelude to needed corporate decisions.

The careful attention of CEOs and other senior executives will be necessary to inaugurate any substantial change in the present character of corporate involvement. The array of current corporate activities suggests the limited and mixed motives for corporate interest. They in fact carry out existing corporate objectives reasonably well. Except for Adopt-a-Schools, none is growing much. Little change is predicted by corporate observers, absent some new "push."

Corporate leaders need, first of all, to identify their interests and requirements. This will be no easy task. The prediction of labor supply requirements is, for example, one of the least developed of the economic arts. The analysis of educational requirements will help illuminate the corporate interest, but leave a rather wide range for the exercise of executive judgment. The extent of basic faith in the importance of public schooling will always be significant in the corporate calculation. Furthermore, if judgments are reached that, in the corporate interest, more should be done to help improve the schools, corporate leaders must still develop confidence that there are specific constructive steps available to express that interest.

Several reflective processes seem called for:

- o at the national level, to determine if there is a shared interest that should be expressed across the business community, from multinational conglomerates to local small business communities

- o at sectoral or industrial levels, to help principal firms (e.g., insurance companies, electronics manufacturers, retail stores) develop shared perspectives and effective activities
- o at the local level, to help each urban community discern and respond to its own distinctive corporate interest in education.

The upshot would be a continuing high-status, low-profile dialogue. It would deal initially with the substance of such matters as human capital development, human resource strategies, basic educational objectives, and the future division of responsibility between corporations and education. Only later would it turn to issues of new program development or advocacy, if and as corporate leadership become convinced they are necessary and feasible. All this must be accomplished, be reminded, with respect to a matter which is of rather low priority to the highest executives, whose involvement is indispensible to any fundamental shift in policy.

This being the case, the consultative process must be arranged very carefully. It should probably be informal, starting with meetings of relatively small groups of senior executives joined by labor leaders and a few knowledgeable authorities on education. It may be that more ambitious schemes (e.g., plans for national commissions and other public activities) will emerge from these meetings; but they cannot and should not be hurried until they rest on new rather than old assumptions about the nature of the corporate interest.

Recommendations:

Organizations of corporate leadership, such as the Committee on Economic Development, the Business Roundtable or the President's Advisory Council on

Prvate Sector Initiatives should seek the personal involvement of CEOs in systematic reviews of the corporate interest in urban education. Subsequently, organizations such as the American Banking Association and the American Council on Life Insurance should be encouraged to develop industry-based discussions.

Similarly, two or three urban areas should be encouraged to develop community-wide discussions by local business leadership. An important objective of these local initiatives would be the development and documentation of effective methodologies for other such local activities.

2. Furnish educational leaders with the knowledge and skills to collaborate effectively with corporate leaders seeking improved schools.

Some educational leaders (and many urban superintendents) already have these attributes, but many (including some urban chiefs) do not. Their experience and training in working with business officials have often been insufficient: they do not know fully what business wants or what they need that business could provide; they are too prone to channel business interests routinely into traditional career and vocational education channels; and they have developed formidable defensive behaviors to cope with the criticisms of the past two decades.

A rather extensive process for the professional education of educators seems called for. Once again, it would best start (as it already has) with discussions among the leaders of education organizations, joined by some urban superintendents and other more specifically knowledgeable and experienced persons. From this start, subsequent developments should proceed in several directions:

- widespread discussions among education's opinion makers and leaders at their national conferences and in the professional development activities of the principal educational organizations.
- expanded opportunities for administrators, teachers, and counselors (present and prospective) to learn about corporate life and requirements, through academic courses (not usually offered in schools of education), summer corporate internships, local collaborative projects, etc.
- careful development of a framework for the involvement of the corporate sector in educational policy and program development. Some necessary components are
  - -- new ways for corporate and educational representatives to specify their basic educational requirements, which can inform program development in the schools
  - -- identification of issues (such as high school renewal) that will provide special opportunities for corporate participation and support
  - -- patterns for the application of corporate expertise to problems of educational administration and management
  - -- political strategies that stimulate corporate understanding, approval, and public support for the local education program
  - -- multiple levels of communication with the corporate world, from the board room to the work bench.

Needless to say, educational leaders must retain their own center of gravity in the midst of this whirlwind of activity. They must know and promote the best educational interests of every student, and be able to know and say when proposed educational schemes, from whatever source, would ill-serve that ineluctible goal.

Recommendations:

The Institute for Educational Leadership or a similar organization should develop specific programs for professional development of educators in this area, involving other organizations as necessary. The National Institute of Work and Learning or a similar organization should develop model projects for the involvement of educators in corporate and business activities, through internships, summer jobs, etc.

3. Encourage the spread of existing good practice in areas related to the corporate interest in education.

As corporations and education expand their collaboration into more ambitious areas as educational planning, management and politics, there must not be any neglect of the existing types of programs and projects that have paved the way and, in the process, helped many schools and students. Indeed, nothing will build and sustain business leadership's enthusiasm more than the continued development and operation of successful programs in and for the schools.

At present there are several distinct yet related varieties of programs: collaborative councils; career education programs; and Adopt-a-School and partnership programs. There are at least a hundred councils, several hundred Adopt-a-School programs and thousands of career education programs ranging from career days to sustained work experience projects outside the school.

In some cases, such as collaborative councils, there have been careful descriptive analyses which explain the components of reputedly successful programs in various locales; but for Adopt-a-School, even such basic information is lacking. In every case, moreover, there are no good evaluative data describing specific effect -- upon student, school, community, or labor market -- let alone detailed studies linking such effects to particular program features or contexts.

The need for some careful identification of good practice is especially great for Adopt-a-School programs at this time. Such programs have considerable promise for bringing everyday corporate and community involvement in the schools to new levels of effectiveness and understanding. But to have sustained effect, Adopt-a-School programs will need more consistency in program and effect than is presently the case.

Basic descriptive and evaluative information is needed, then, in every area. Also needed is some system for dissemination. Businessmen and educators alike complain about the absence of solid information on the best or even customary ways to proceed in these programs. The directors of individual studies and projects make noble efforts to "spread the word," but absent any clearinghouse or similar information storage and retrieval center, the general availability of any one important element of knowledge or experience is hit-or-miss. More active dissemination strategies, involving manuals or technical assistance materials, would be yet another needed step, once the basic information was customarily collected in some one place.

It is time to move beyond the universal: "Go see how they do it in Dallas."

Recommendations:

An individual or small team of analysts should be commissioned to study Adopt-a-School programs nationwide, and develop protocols for their successful development and sustenance. In addition, the National Institute of Work and Learning or a similar organization should be commissioned to develop dissemination strategies for corporate programs assisting the schools.

4. Develop and test new modes of collaboration and support.

There are, at any given time in an area such as this a few emerging notions that could use some careful nurture and scrutiny at the outset, to assess their potential before they either disappear or explode in numbers. Adopt-a-School was probably a good example, a few years ago. Collaborative councils had some such experience with a controlled and tested development under the National Institute for Work and Learning. More such care should be the rule: ideas become more clearly specified and persuasive; and the ensuing projects more effective and often less costly.

Two related notions merit such careful attention now:

- o strategies for corporate giving programs focusing on urban elementary and secondary education.

  One likely result of the greater attention of corporate leaders, with the more active encouragement of educators, is that some of the barriers to corporate giving to the schools will lower. But there is at present little in the way of positive suggestions as to how corporations might best advance such a new objective of giving.

  Any such programs should concentrate on the provision of

"marginal monies" that apply leverage to the large, publicly provided, but inflexible budgets of the cities' schools. They might also require decentralized decision-making within the corporation at the local operating level. Their development and promulgation would require systematic effort by a counterpart to (or supplementary effort by) the Council on Financial Aid to Education (CFAE).

- o <u>private local foundations (supported by corporations and others) for school improvement</u>.

  A few local educational foundations have already sprung up for this purpose. They enjoy corporate participation and are finding ways to invigorate school programs with small amounts of money (as described above). Their wider development will require some ways to encourage pooling contributions (where many previous efforts have failed) over an extended period of time. The large-scale community foundations and trusts that exist in almost every city could also support such programs; none, so far as can be seen, is now very active in public education.

These are just two obvious opportunities at this juncture. Additional candidates would be added by others and at other times.

<u>Recommendations</u>:

The Council for Financial Aid to Education, the Center for Effective Philanthropy and similar organizations develop and encourage strategies for corporate giving to public education, directly and thrcugh local foundations.

5. Provide institutional capacity to encourage local initiatives, to convene forums and training sessions, analyze issues, and disseminate information, nationwide.

It is simple fact that there are no institutions in our nation with the current capacity and resources, individually or together, to carry out more than a fraction of the recommendations described above, at the national level. These are areas in which neither the public nor the private sector has invested much in institution building. Organizations like the National Institute for Work and Learning and the Conference Board have examined some aspects of the problem; and the NIWL and a handful of smaller organizations have successfully fostered some new kinds of local activity. But the information base is thin; the knowledgeable professionals with any national experience number in the tens, not hundreds; and cutbacks in public sector support are already serious and, in the short-term, irreversible. What little capacity has been built is right now melting away.

More organizational capacity is needed to carry out recommendations like those outlined above over several years' time, and to help solve other specific problems that we already know need solutions. To name a few such problems already mentioned here and in the literature:

- o development of action strategies to improve corporate (and labor) involvement in education, at local, state, sectoral and national levels.
- o a specific, detailed examination of the nature of small business needs and interests with respect to urban education.
- o expanding corporate understanding and involvement in key policy development processes: in school finance, vouchers, tuition tax

credits, high school renewal, vocational education reforms.

- o keeping up with scientific literacy: specifying future corporate requirements for science and math education.
- o reviewing barriers (e.g., state regulations, insurance liability) and incentives (e.g., tax credits or deductions) for corporate support and assistance.

The list illustrates the complex future that our corporate and educational leaders may encounter together. They will need continuous encouragement, advice, and assistance to proceed. It should be carefully provided for in advance, in the form of persons and institutions ready to help.

Recommendations:

The Conference Board, the Committee for Economic Development, the National Institute of Work and Learning, or other prospective sources of permanent expertise should propose (for public or private support) core programs of several years' duration to monitor and advance the corporate involvement in public education.

* * * *

Never in recent times has our national political leadership placed such hope and confidence in "private-sector initiatives" to improve the performance of our social and economic institutions. Could there be a better cause -- or a better case -- for such initiative than the improvement of our cities' schools?

APPENDIX A

PERSONS INTERVIEWED

The persons listed below were interviewed, for the most part in person but a few by telephone, between February and October, 1981. The interviews were open ended and were used both to collect data and to help formulate conclusions. The positions listed are those held at the time of the interview.

John Alden, Associate Director for Corporate Giving, Bank of America, San Francisco, California

Robert Alioto, Superintendent of Schools, San Francisco, California

Robert Andringa, Executive Director, Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colorado

Gregory Anrig, Commissioner of Education, State of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts

Sol Arbeiter, College Entrance Examination Board, New York, New York

Richard Arnold, Manager, Education Relations, American Telephone and Telegraph Company, New York, New York

Warren Bacon, Vice President, Inland Steel, Chicago, Illinois

Adrienne Y. Bailey, Senior Staff Assistant, Chicago Community Trust, Chicago, Illinois

Mary Jo Bane, Associate Professor, J.F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Paul E. Barton, Vice President, National Institute for Work & Learning, Washington, D.C.

Peggy Blandford, Education Program Officer, Chicago United, Chicago, Illinois

Roderick Boggs, Executive Director, Washington, D.C. Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, Washington, D.C.

Gene V. Bottoms, Executive Director, American Vocational Association, Washington, D.C.

Ernest L. Boyer, President, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, Washington, D.C.

David Breneman, Senior Fellow, Brookings Institute, Washington, D.C.

Letitia Chambers, Staff Director, U.S. Senate Committee on Labor & Public Welfare, Washington, D.C.

Phyllis Cohen, Management Academy, Dade County Schools, Miami, Florida

John Cornman, President, National Rural Center, Washington, D.C.

John Corbally, President, MacArthur Foundation, Chicago, Illinois

Ramon Cortines, Superintendent of Schools, Pasadena, California

Gina Craig, Director of Volunteer Programs, Dade County Public Schools, Miami, Florida

Robert Craig, Director of Communications, American Society for Training & Development, Washington, D.C.

Lawrence A. Cremin, President, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, New York

Alonzo A. Crim, Superintendent of Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

K. Patricia Cross, Visiting Professor, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Donna Cummings, Manager, TRW Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio

Luvern L. Cunningham, Professor of Educational Administration, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

Joyce Daniels, Chamber of Commerce, Atlanta, Georgia

R. Morton Darrow, Vice President for Planning & Analysis, Prudential Insurance Company, Newark, New Jersey

Henry David, Director, Vocational Education Study, National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C.

John Davis, President, Macalester College, St. Paul, Minnesota

Anne Decker, Assistant Director of Research, Council for Financial Aid to Education, New York, New York

Yvette del Carlo, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, San Francisco, California

Dennis Detzel, Vice President, Hay Associates, Chicago, Illinois

Arthur M. Dubow, President, The Boston Company of Texas, Boston, Massachusetts

Ramona Edelin, National Urban Coalition, Washington, D.C.

Marion Wright Edelman, President, Children's Defense Fund, Washington, D.C.

Russell Edgerton, President, American Association of Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

Ron Edwards, Superintendent, East Cleveland Schools, East Cleveland, Ohio

Nolen Ellison, Chancellor, Cuyahoga Community College, Cleveland, Ohio

Mary Ellen Fahs, President, Public Education Association, New York, New York

Badi Foster, Associate Professor, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Carol Gibson, Director of Education Programs, National Urban League, New York, New York

Gerald G. Gold, Senior Program Officer, National Institute for Work and Learning, Washington, D.C.

Thomas Goodman, Superintendent of Schools, San Diego, California

Sandra Gray, Executive Director, National School Volunteers Program, Alexandria, Virginia

Richard Green, Supperintendent of Schools, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Gene Guisart, Professor of Education, St. Johns University, New York, New York

Samuel Halperin, President, Institute for Educational Leadership, Washington, D.C.

Harry Handler, Deputy Superintendent of Schools, Los Angeles, California

Fred Hechinger, President, New York Times Foundation, New York, New York

Madeline Hemmings, Director of Education Programs, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

Terry Herndon, Executive Director, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

Jan Hively, Director of Comprehensive Planning, Minneapolis Public Schools, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Harold Hodgkinson, President, NTL Institute, Arlington, Virginia

David Hornbeck, Commissioner of Education, State of Maryland, Annapolis, Maryland

Harold H. Howe, II, Vice President for Education & Research, Ford Foundation, New York, New York

Shirley Hufstedler, Attorney, Los Angeles, California

James Jacobs, Superintendent of Schools, Cincinnati, Ohio

H. Thomas James, President, Spencer Foundation, Chicago, Illinois

Arthur Jefferson, Superintendent of Schools, Detroit, Michigan

Jeffrey Johnson, Director, Private School Development, 70001 Ltd., Washington, D.C.

James Kelly, Program Officer, Ford Foundation, New York, New York

Sherrill Kilner, President, Junior League, Miami, Florida

Eugenia Kemble, Special Assistant to the President, American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.

Francis Keppel, Lecturer, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Michael Kirst, Professor of Politics and Education, Stanford School of Education, Palo Alto, California

Regina Kyle, Visiting Scholar, National Institute for Work and Learning, Washington, D.C.

Hernan LaFontaine, Superintendent of Schools, Hartford, Connecticut

James Langston, Vice President for Social Policy, Bank of America, San Francisco, California

Archie La Pointe, Wirtz & La Pointe, Washington, D.C.

Sara Lunsford, Manager of Corporate Contributions, Coca Cola Co., Atlanta, Georgia

Betsy Levin, Dean, University of Colorado Law School, Boulder, Colorado

Henry Levin, Director, Institute for Finance and Governance, Stanford Graduate School of Education, Palo Alto, California

Scott Llewellyn, Acting Director, Chamber of Commerce, Miami, Florida

Edward Lotspeich, Director for Corporate Involvement, Board of Education, Cleveland, Ohio

Ruth G. Love, Superintendent of Schools, Chicago, Illinois

Seymour Lusterman, The Conference Board, New York, New York

Ernest A. Lynton, Commonwealth Professor, University of Massachusetts, Boston, Massachusetts

Gordon McAndrew, Superintendent of Schools, Columbia, South Carolina

William McCaffrey, Vice President for Human Resources, Equitable Life Assurance Society, New York, New York

Phyllis McClure, Legal Defense Fund, NAACP, Washington, D.C.

Robert MacGregor, Executive Director, Chamber of Commerce, Kansas City, Missouri

Albert McKinnon, Associate Commissioner, New York State Department of Education, Albany, New York

Frank Macchiarola, Chancellor, New York City Public Schools, New York, New York

Carl Marburger, President, National Committee for Citizens in Education, Columbia, Maryland

Michael Marcase, Superintendent of Schools, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Henry Marcheschi, President, American Telecon, Pasadena, California

John Martin, Program Officer, Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.

Edward Meade, Senior Program Officer, Ford Foundation, New York, New York

Steven Minter, Vice President, Cleveland Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio

Thomas Miller, Vice President for Educational Programs, Control Data Corporation, Minneapolis, Minnesota

David Moberly, Superintendent of Schools, Seattle, Washington

Daniel Morley, Vice President, State Street Bank, Boston, Massachusetts

Fred Nelson, Associate Director for Corporate Giving, Atlantic Richfield Corporation, Los Angeles, California

Boyd Odom, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Atlanta, Georgia

Alan Pifer, President, Carnegie Corporation, New York, New York

Electra Price, Director of Community Relations, Oakland Public Schools, Oakland, California

Robert Price, President, Control Data Corporation, Minneapolis, Minnesota

Lois Rice, Vice President for Government Relations, Control Data Corporation, Washington, D.C.

Wilson Riles, Superintendent of Public Instruction, State of California, Sacramento, California

John B. Ruchalski, Senior Vice President, Burdines Department Stores, Miami, Florida

Robert Sampieri, Career Education Coordinator, Los Angeles Unified School District, Los Angeles, California

Patrick Scollard, Senior Vice President, Chemical Bank, New York, New York

Edward Sermeier, Chancellor's Office, New York Public Schools, New York, New York

Donna Shalala, President, Hunter College, New York, New York

Thomas Shannon, Executive Director, National School Boards Association, Washington, D.C.

Albert Shanker, President, American Federation of Teachers, Washington, D.C.

Jonathan Sher, Visiting Professor of Education, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, North Carolina

Dorothy Shields, Director of Education Program, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

Jeanne Sigler, Public Education Association, New York, New York

Ted Small, Director, Private Industry Council, New York, New York

Hayden Smith, Senior Vice President, Council for Financial Aid to Education, New York, New York

Rolland Smith, Metropolitan Cleveland Jobs Council, Cleveland, Ohio

Donald Spaulding, IBM, Boston, Massachusetts

Richard Spies, Vice President, Kaiser Industries, Oakland, California

William Spring, Trilateral Council, Boston, Massachusetts

Nevzer Stacey, Senior Program Officer, National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C.

Carol Stone, Director, Industry Labor Education Council, Portland, Oregon

Julia Thomas, Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Texas

Wayne Thompson, Senior Vice President, Dayton-Hudson Corp., Minneapolis, Minnesota

Steven Tobia, Chamber of Commerce, Los Angeles, California

Rachel Tompkins, Citizens' Council for Ohio Schools, Cleveland, Ohio

Vincent Troiano, Assistant Director, Association of Business Labor and Education (ABLE), New York Alliance of Business, New York, New York

Marc Tucker, Associate Director, National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C.

David Tyack, Professor of History, Stanford Graduate School of Education, Palo Alto, California

Richard Ungerer, Senior Staff Associate, National Institute for Work and Learning, Washington, D.C.

Hank Weiss, California Industry Education Labor Council, Burlingame, California

William Wilken, Executive Director, National Association of State Boards of Education, Washington, D.C.

W. Willard Wirtz, Wirtz and La Pointe, Washington, D.C.

Robert Wood, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Roger Yarrington, Vice President for Research and Development, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.

Paul Ylvisaker, Dean, Harvard Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, Massachusetts

Barbara Z'belle, Connecticut General Life Insurance, Hartford, Connecticut

APPENDIX B

AFL-CIO Department of Education. How Schools are Teaching About Labor: A Collection of Guidelines and Lesson Plans. Washington, D.C.: AFL-CIO, nd.

Anderson, Bernard E. and Isabel V. Sawhill (eds.). Youth Employment and Public Policy. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Andrews, K.R. "Can the Best Corporations Be Made Moral?" Harvard Business Review, Vol. 51, No. 3 (May-June 1973), pp. 72-94.

Barton, Paul E. Vocations and Education Policy: A Federal Perspective. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Work and Learning, 1981.

Barton, Paul E. (ed.). Implementing New Education-Work Policies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.

Barton, Paul E. and Bryna Shore Fraser. Between Two Worlds: Youth Transition from School to Work, Volume 2: Programs and Experimentation. Washington, D.C.: National Manpower Institute, 1978.

Baum, Judith and Jeanne Sigler. Lend-a-Hand to Improve Your Schools. New York: Public Education Association, 1980.

Bendiner, Robert. The Politics of Work. New York: Harper and Row, 1969.

Berger, Peter L. and John Neuhaus. To Empower People: The Role of Mediating Structures in Public Policy. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute, 1977.

Bers, Trudy. School-Community Communication: School Board Members and Their Constituents. Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1980.

Branscomb, Lewis M. and Paul C. Gilmore. "Education in Private Industry." Daedalus, Vol. 104 (Winter 1975), pp. 222-233.

Thomas Buffington and Associates. Follow the Yellow Brick Roads. Washington, D.C., 1979.

Bulpitt, Mildred and Judith Kaderlik Lohff. It's Your Business! Cooperative Efforts Between Community Colleges and Business/Industry. Phoenix: Maricipa Community Colleges, 1980.

Burt, Samuel M. and Leon M. Lessinger. Volunteer Industry Involvement in Public Education. Lexington, MA: Heath Lexington Books, 1970.

Byrom, Fletcher L. "The Corporate Stake in Better High Schools." Wall Street Journal, October 5, 1981.

Cabot, Louis W. "Corporate Support for Education: No Strings Attached." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 48, No. 4 (July-August 1978), pp. 28-42.

Callahan, Raymond E. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962.

The Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education. Giving Youth a Better Chance: Options for Education, Work, and Service. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1979.

Carnevale, Anthony. Memorandum to ASTD National Issues Committee and Guests. Washington, D.C.: American Society for Training and Development, Inc., July 14, 1981.

Center for Education and Work. Industry-Education-Labor Collaboration: The Literature of Collaborative Councils. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Work and Learning, 1981.

Chaffee, John, Jr. Business-School Partnerships: A Plus for Kids. Arlington, VA: National School Public Relations Association, 1980.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Blueprint for the Possible: A Citizens' Action Program for Better Schools. Washington, D.C. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1973.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Career Education. Washington, D.C.: Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America, 1975.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Contact: A Directory of Business and Economic Education Programs. Washington, D.C. Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1980.

Chase, Francis S. Educational Quandaries and Opportunities. Washington, D.C.: The Council of the Great City Schools, 1980.

Cistone, Peter J. Understanding School Boards. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1975.

Committee for Economic Development. Education for the Urban Disadvantaged from Preschool to Employment. New York: CED, 1971.

Committee on the Humanities. Humanities in American Life. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

Corrigan, Gary J. "Corporate Training: A Career for Teachers?" Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 61, No. 5 (January 1980), pp. 328-331.

Council for Financial Aid to Education. The CFAE Casebook: A Cross-Section of Corporate Aid-to-Education Programs. New York: CFAE, 1980.

Council for Financial Aid to Education. A Sampling of Corporate Statements on Social Responsibility, Contributions Policies and Procedures. New York: CFAE, 1979.

Cremin, Lawrence A. The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Cross, Patricia K. "Exploring New Frontiers in Higher Education," Address presented at the 1981 National Conference on Higher Education sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, 1981.

Darrow, R. Morton. "Corporate Social Responsibility and Social Indicators," in Robert L. Clewett and Jerry C. Olson (eds.), Social Indicators and Marketing. State College, PA: The Pennsylvania State University, n.d.

Davis, K. W.C. Frederick, and R.L. Blomstrom. Business and Society: Concepts and Policy Issues. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1980.

Education Commission of the States. Collaboration in State Career Education Policy Development: The Role of Business, Industry and Labor. Denver: ECS, 1979.

The 80's: How Will Public Education Respond? Washington, D.C.: The Council of Chief State School Offices, 1979.

Etzioni, Amitai. "Reindustrialization: The Basic Thesis": Testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, January 27, 1981. Washington, D.C.: George Washington University (xerox), 1981.

Ferrin, Richard I. and Solomon Arbeiter. Bridging the Gap: A Study of Education-to-Work Linkages. Princeton, NJ: College Entrance Examination Board, 1975.

Finley, G.J. Business and Education: A Fragile Partnership. New York: The Conference Board, 1973.

Galbraith, John Kenneth. The New Industrial State. New York: Signet Books, 1967.

Gardner, John. "The Private Pursuit of Public Interest." Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 17, No. 17 (January 8, 1979), p. 56.

Ginzberg, Eli and George J. Vojta. "The Service Sector of the U.S. Economy." Scientific American, Vol. 244, No. 3 (March 1981), pp. 48-55.

Giving in America: Toward a Stronger Voluntary Sector. Report of the Commission on Private Philanthropy and Public Needs, 1975.

Gold, Gerald G. (ed.). Business and Higher Education: Toward New Alliances. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1981.

Gold, Gerard G. "Industry-Education-Labor Collaboration: Designing Mechanisms for Sustained Impact." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, April 16, 1981. Washington, D.C.: xerox, National Institute for Work and Learning, 1981.

Goldstein, Harold. Training and Education by Industry. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Work and Learning, 1980.

Green, Mark. "Corporate Good Guys." Nation, Vol. 230, No. 10 (March 15, 1980), pp. 304-06.

Harty, Sheila. Hucksters in the Classroom: A Review of Industry Propaganda in Schools. Washington, D.C.: Center for Study of Responsive Law, 1979.

Herrnstadt, Irwin L., Morris A. Horowitz, and Andrew M. Sum. The Transition from School to Work: The Contribution of Cooperative Education Programs at the Secondary Level. Boston: Northeastern University, 1979.

Kantor, Harvey and David Tyack (eds.). Work, Youth and Schooling: Historical Perspective on Vocational Education. Stanford, CA: Stanford University, 1979.

Kerr, Clark and Jerome M. Rosow (eds.). Work in America: The Decade Ahead. New York: Work in America Institute, Inc., 1978.

Koch, Frank. The New Corporate Philanthropy. New York: Plenum Press, 1979.

Kyle, Regina M.J. Human Resource Development and Economic Vitality: The Education-Work Nexus. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1981.

Leonard, Mary. Directory of Grantmakers Interested in Precollegiate Education. Washington, D.C.: Council on Foundations, 1981.

Lesher, Richard. "Education and Business: Partners for Human Progress." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 61, No. 413 (December 1977), pp. 98-103.

Levin, Henry M. (ed.). Community Control of Schools. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1970.

Lusterman, Seymour. Education in Industry. New York: The Conference Board, 1977.

Lusterman, Seymour. Minorities in Engineering: The Corporate Role. New York: The Conference Board, 1979.

Lusterman, Seymour and Harriet Gorlin. Educating Students for Work: Some Business Roles. New York: The Conference Board, 1980.

Lynton, Ernest A. "The Role of Colleges and Universities in Corporate Education." Paper prepared for The Ford Foundation (xerox), 1981.

McKie, James W. (ed.). Social Responsibility and the Business Predicament. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1974.

McMurrin, Sterling M. (ed.). Resources for Urban Schools: Better Use and Balance. New York: Committee for Economic Development, 1971.

Malott, R.H. "Corporate Support for Education: Some Strings Attached." Harvard Business Review, Vol. 48, No. 4 (July/August 1978), pp. .

National Academy of Education, Task Force on Education and Employment. Education for Employment: Knowledge for Action. Washington, D.C.: Acropolis Books, 1979.

National Center for Education Statistics. High School and Beyond: A Capsule Description of High School Students. Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1981.

National Commission for Employment Policy. Expanding Employment Opportunities for Disadvantaged Youth. Washington, D.C.: National Commission for Employment Policy, 1979.

National School Boards Association. Report of the 1979-80 Task Force on Vocational Education: Present and Future Needs. Washington, D.C.: National School Boards Association, 1980.

National Science Foundation and the Department of Education. Science & Engineering Education for the 1980's & Beyond. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

National Urban Coalition. Collaborative Programs in Urban Schools: Case Studies. Washington, D.C.: National Urban Coalition (xerox), 1980.

Newsom, Barbara J. Report to the Trustees of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund on the State of Corporate Philanthropy. New York: Xeroxed memorandum, 1979.

O'Toole, James. Work, Learning, and the American Future. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1977.

Panel on Government and the Advancement of Social Justice, Health, Welfare, Education, and Civil Rights of the President's Commission for a National Agenda for the Eighties. Government and the Advancement of Social Justice, Health, Welfare, Education, and Civil Rights in the Eighties. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Poland, Robert (ed.). Career Education in Business Education: Methods for Involving the Business Community. Reston, VA: National Business Education Association, 1980.

The Prudential Foundation - 1980 Annual Report. Newark, NJ: Prudential Foundation, 1981.

Purcell, Elizabeth A., John W. Alden, and Terry Lynn Nagle (eds.). Business and Education: Partners for the 80's. Alexandria, VA: National School Volunteer Program, Inc., 1981.

Ravitch, Diane. The Revisionists Revised. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1978.

Robison, David. Training and Jobs Programs in Action (Case Studies in Private-Sector Initiatives for the Hard-to-Employ). Washington, D.C.: Committee for Economic Development in cooperation with Work in America Institute, 1978.

Robison, David. "Youth Access to Private Sector Jobs: The Sorceror's Apprentice," The Vice President's Task Force on Youth Employment, in A Review of Youth Employment Problems, Programs and Policies. Volume 3. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980.

Rudick, Lois (ed.). Work-Education Councils: Profiles of Collaborative Efforts. Washington, D.C.: National Manpower Institute, 1979.

Shive, Jerrold and Joseph F. Rogus. "The School-Business Partnership: A Concept Revitalized." The Clearinghouse, Vol. 52, No. 6 (February 1979), pp. 286-291.

Smith, G.B. "Employee-Sponsored Recurrent Education in the United States: A Report on Recent Inquiries into its Structure." Paper presented to the IFG/OECD Seminar on the Cost and Financing of Recurrent Education, July 1980. Washington, D.C.: National Institute for Work and Learning, 1980.

Special Task Force on Education. Chicago School System: Recommended Actions. Chicago: Special Task Force on Education, 1981.

Spring, Joel H. Education and the Rise of the Corporate State. Boston: Beacon Press, 1972.

Standard Oil Company (Indiana). Organizations Providing or Interested in Business or Economic Education Materials or Information. Chicago: Standard Oil Company, 1978.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Business and Society: Strategies for the 1980's, Report of the Task Force on Corporate Performance. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1981.

The University of the State of New York. A Guide to Educational Programs in Noncollegiate Organizations. Albany, NY: SUNY, 1980.

Wagner, Alan P. An Inventory of Post-Compulsory Education and Training Programs in the U.S. and Sources of Support. Stanford, CA: Institute for Finance and Governance, Stanford University, 1980.

Yarrington, Roger (ed.). Employee Training for Productivity. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1980.